

REMARKS

In the final Office Action mailed December 28, 2007¹, the Examiner rejected claims 2-7, 9-15, 17, 18, 25-30, 33-42, 46, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0076022 to Bedingfield ("*Bedingfield*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,947,538 to Shen et al. ("*Shen*"); and rejected claims 31, 32, 38, 43-45, 72-74, 102, and 103 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bedingfield* in view of *Shen* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,259 to Patel et al. ("*Patel*"); and allowed claims 48-54, 57-71, 75-101, and 105-113.

By this Amendment, Applicants propose to cancel claims 2-7, 9-15, 17, 18, 25-47, 72-74, and 102-104, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 48-54, 57-71, 75-101, and 105-113 will be pending.

I. The Telephonic Interview of January 23, 2008

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of January 23, 2008 with Applicants' representative. A summary of the interview is outlined below.

Claim 104 is listed as rejected on the Office Action Summary. However, claim 104 is not referenced in the body of the Office Action. In the interview, Applicants' representative requested the Examiner to clarify the status of claim 104. The Examiner

¹ As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are believed to be sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to certain requirements applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references) is not a concession by Applicants that such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such in the future.

responded by indicating that claim 104 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bedingfield* in view of *Shen*.

The Examiner reiterated the rejections of claims 46, 74, and 104 based on combinations of *Bedingfield*, *Shen*, and *Patel*, and suggested possible amendments to the rejected claims. Applicants have not chosen to make such amendments, but will consider whether to pursue the rejected claims in a continuation application.

II. The Rejections of Claims 2-7, 9-15, 17, 18, 25-30, 31, 32 33-46, 47, 72-74, 102, and 103 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants have canceled the rejected claims in order to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) are moot.

III. Claims 48-54, 57-71, 75-101, and 105-113

Pending claims 48-54, 57-71, 75-101, and 105-113 are allowed (Final Office Action at p. 12), and each of the rejected claims has been canceled in this amendment. Accordingly, upon entry of this amendment this application will be in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter the amendment and issue the Notice of Allowance.

IV. Conclusion


Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance, for the reasons discussed above.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned (202-408-4398) in the event that there are any remaining issues in this application.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Reply, please charge
the fee to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 25, 2008

By: 
Philip J. Hoffmann
Reg. No. 46,340